

Serial No. 09/661,273

- 14 -

Art Unit: 2155

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are presented for examination. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-17, 21, 23-27, 31, 33-37, 41, 43-47, 51, and 53-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Garrity in view of Rosser. Claims 5-7, 9, 18-20, 22, 28-30, 32, 38-40, 42, 48-50 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Garrity and Rosser in view of Dobbins. Claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45, and 55 are currently amended. Reconsideration is requested.

The Office objected to the recitation of "thereby facilitating changing channels" in claims 1, 15, 25, 35 and 45. In particular, the Office stated that the limitation is not connected with the claim language and is unclear. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Facilitating changing channels is the basic subject matter of this application. The title of the application recites "receiver access control in an internet television system." The Background describes how an IP multicast group can be used to transmit television signals to subscribers. Page 2, lines 19-22. In order to limit subscriber access to only those channels which the subscriber is authorized to view, different channels may be provided in different multicast groups. Page 2, lines 23-30. However, changing multicast groups, which is required to change channels, is a relatively slow process in comparison with the speed of channel changing supported by broadcast and cable television services. Page 3, lines 6-12. Hence, "an access control mechanism that provides for quick channel changes is needed." Page 3, lines 12-13. The Summary and detailed description describe solutions for the problem of changing channels in an Internet television system, such as by distributing access control information from a distribution device to an access device. (e.g., at Page 3, lines 18-23) An advantage of the described solution is that "because the access device obtains the access control information before the request is received from the host, there is essentially no delay in authenticating the host," which "in turn reduces delays in changing

Serial No. 09/661,273

- 15 -

Art Unit: 2155

channels.” Page 5, lines 19-21. It should also be noted that the recited language is not a limitation of the claims but rather describes the result of the recited elements. Hence, the specification not only supports the recited language, but it is one of the central features described in the application and it’s meaning is clear. Withdrawal of the objections is therefore requested.

With regard to the cited references, each of the references alone and in combination fails to teach moving multicast group access control information closer to the subscriber to facilitate rapid authentication and rapid channel changing in an Internet television system which uses multicast groups. Figure 4 of Garrity shows an architecture where User Server 404 must access Customer Account Profiles 424 located somewhere outside server 400 (Garrity does not state where) for access control information, so it is by definition a multistep process in which the Policy Enforcement Point (PEP) does not have, prior to the request, the information required to also function as the Policy Decision Point (PDP). In particular, User Server 404 does not have, prior to receiving a request, information to authenticate consumers. Rosser does not describe an IP multicast television distribution system, and consequently fails to teach distribution of multicast group access control information in any manner. Dobbins teaches authentication, but not by moving multicast group access control information closer to the subscriber. Claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 have been amended to emphasize the distinction that the distributed access control information is *multicast group* access control information. Hence, the claims distinguish the cited references not only because access control information is moved closer to the subscriber, but also because that information is multicast group access control information. For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/661,273

- 16 -

Art Unit: 2155


Claims 2-14, 16-24, 26-34, 36-44, and 46-54 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are also allowable for the same reasons stated above with regard to their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-14, 16-24, 26-34, 36-44, and 46-54 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Holmes W. Anderson, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 (X305) so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

January 27, 2005
Date


Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-194

Dd: 4/13/2005